

Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts
April 18, 1962

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley
Douglas W. Orr
Ralph Walker
Peter Hurd

L.R. Wilson, Secretary
Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Susan E. Bennett, Admin. Secretary
Gilbert Halasz, Recorder

I. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

✓ Howard University - Classroom Building - Proposed Design

The Commission discussed the features of the proposed design with Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Division of the Public Buildings Service, and Mr. Branch Elam, architect, of the firm of Justement, Elam, Callmer and Kidd.

Mr. Elam explained the various activities which the building will serve and illustrated the architectural solution by means of drawings and a perspective of the front elevation of the building. He also indicated that an effort had been made to design the classroom building so that it would be compatible with the Home Economics Building, now nearing completion. No comparison with this building could be made because the Commission had never been furnished with drawings of the final design of the Home Economics Building. The members agreed that the general mass of the building was satisfactory, but they felt that the design divided the main facade of the building into two parts. They suggested that the horizontal expression of the right portion be carried through the entire facade. The architect agreed to restudy the fenestration and to submit new sketches at the May meeting.

Howard University - Home Economics Building - Status of Recommendations for Changes

The Chairman asked Mr. Snyder if he would tell the members what recommendations of the Commission had been incorporated in the Home Economics Building. He pointed out that the proposed design had been reviewed by the Commission in February 1959 and that a letter had been sent to the Administrator of General Services recommending certain changes and inviting the architect to return in March. However, the Commission's records

indicated that the project had not been again reviewed by the Commission. The members felt that it would be helpful to know if the Commission's recommendations regarding the appearance of the Home Economics Building, had been included in the design because of its close relationship to the new classroom building. Mr. Snyder replied that he was under the impression that the Commission had approved the design but that he would look into the situation and report to the Commission.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter to the Administrator of General Services setting forth the Commission's recommendations.

EXHIBITS A & B

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

a. E Street Expressway - Status

The Commission met with Mr. Harold Aitken, Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, and Mrs. Chloethiel Smith, architectural consultant, to discuss the status of plans for the architectural treatment of the E Street Expressway.

Mr. Aitken explained that following the presentation of the proposed plans to the Commission in October, 1960, the Red Cross had requested the Highway Department to provide for a pedestrian bridge 44 feet wide across the Expressway in line with the south entrance of the Red Cross Headquarters Building, located on E Street, between 20th and 21st Streets, N.W. In response to this request the Department had directed Mrs. Smith to prepare a scale model of the area showing the Expressway and the requested bridge. Mrs. Smith was asked to explain the model which Mr. Aitken had brought with him.

Mrs. Smith demonstrated on the model how a bridge could be incorporated in the design of the Expressway. She stated that in her opinion the bridge produced an unnecessary series of tunnel openings and bridge faces, and that she would prefer to see the money spent on landscaping. She also pointed out that from Virginia Avenue it would be difficult to see the entrance of the Red Cross Building across the top of the bridge. As an alternative, she suggested the construction of a plaza and fountain or memorial south of the Expressway and in line with the entrance to the building. She demonstrated on the model how these features might appear.

The members agreed that a pedestrian bridge would not materially benefit either the area or the Red Cross building and that a plaza and fountain as suggested by Mrs. Smith were preferable.

Mr. Aitken showed the members a site plan of the portion of the Expressway directly north of the State Department Building and explained that approximately 80 feet more of the depressed roadway just east of the line of 22d Street would be covered than had been proposed when the plan

was first presented to the Commission in October, 1960. He explained that it was impossible to cover that portion of the depressed roadway in its entirety because of the necessity for an access ramp from the Expressway to the north entrance of the State Department Building and Virginia Avenue.

The members expressed disappointment that their original recommendation to cover the entire length of the depressed roadway would not be followed, but accepted the idea of a plaza and fountain and an additional 80 feet of covered roadway as at least an improvement over the previous scheme.

Mrs. Smith showed the members a drawing of polygonal stone panels which she proposed as an alternative to the panels of ashlar stone treatment that is the more commonplace for exposed retaining walls flanking roadways. The members agreed that the polygonal stone might be more appropriate than the customary ashlar stone, but decided that before making a final decision samples of the stone and the pattern of masonry, as well as the complete details of all additional architectural and landscape features, should be submitted to the Commission.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendations.

EXHIBIT C

B. Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Proposed Repaving of Median Strip

Mr. Aitken explained to the members that the tracks and pedestrian safety islands of the abandoned trolley car system would soon be removed from Pennsylvania Avenue. The Department of Highways and Traffic proposed to install a median strip of buff-colored bricks, with curb nosings at the intersections of the cross streets that could be removed for all ceremonial processions. He showed the members a sample of the proposed brick and drawings illustrating how the median strip might appear.

The members of the Commission agreed that it would be premature to approve such a permanent installation in view of the possible rehabilitation of Pennsylvania Avenue by the President's Committee. Mr. Aitken replied that if this was the consensus of opinion his department would pave the street with asphalt and paint a median strip on the new surface as a temporary measure.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter to Engineer Commissioner Clarke informing him of the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT D

c. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Parcel 110c, Southwest Urban Renewal Area - Plans for Development

Mr. Stanley Sherman, Chief of Project Design, RIA, Mr. Morris Lapidus, and Mr. Harold Leibman, architects of the firm of Lapidus, Harle and Leibman, conferred with the Commission on the proposed design sponsored by the D. C. Realty Company, a subsidiary of the D.C. Transit Company, for a site on the Washington Channel north of Fort McNair at Fourth Street, S.W.

Mr. Lapidus and Mr. Leibman explained the project with drawings and a scale model, which showed the various buildings and landscaping. Featured in the design were two high-rise apartment buildings, a maison-ette building, and two groups of town houses arranged around a Promenade Plaza. All parking would be underground or in covered areas under the Plaza. Also included here a swimming pool and recreation areas.

The members liked the general arrangement of the project, but preferred the color of the exterior of the buildings shown in the model to that shown in the renderings which appeared too brilliant. It was also pointed out that bright yellow paving shown in the Promenade Plaza would reflect a high degree of heat and light into the nearby buildings, and the Commission recommended that a light-absorbent material be used in this area. With these two recommendations the project was approved.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT E

d. National Capital Planning Commission and D.C.Redevlopment
Land Agency

Adams-Morgan Northwest Urban Renewal Area - Proposed Land Use
Plan

The Commission conferred with Mr. Donald F. Bozarth and Mr. Lawrence S. Press, staff members of the National Capital Planning Commission, regarding a preliminary plan for the designated area.

Mr. Bozarth explained that the plan was prepared with the cooperation of a Citizens Planning Committee composed of representatives of various citizens associations in the area. He described the project as the first "conservation-rehabilitation" type project in the District of Columbia, and explained that this title applied because over 80% of the existing structures will remain, provided that they are rehabilitated according to standards that would be appropriate to the area.

Mr. Press outlined the boundaries of the project, i.e. on the south, Florida Avenue and U Street; on the east, 16th Street; on the north, Columbia Road and Calvert Street; and on the west, Rock Creek Parkway and Connecticut Avenue. The area comprises approximately 245 acres. He described the existing economic, recreational and social problems in the various parts of the project area. Finally, Mr. Press explained

the proposed changes in land useage, such as street closings, increased land for school playground purposes and parks, new residential and shopping areas, etc.

The members thought that the presentation was well studied and expressed general approval that this type of conservation-rehabilitation renewal project was being undertaken. They asked that further development of the plan be presented to the Commission for its consideration.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter to the Chairman of the Planning Commission expressing the members' interest in the project.

EXHIBIT F

e. District of Columbia Zoning Commission

Island Vista Corporation - Watergate Development

The Commission conferred with General Frederick J. Clarke, Engineering Commissioner and Chairman of the D.C. Zoning Commission, regarding the proposed plan for the Watergate Project in Foggy Bottom.

General Clarke explained that the Zoning Commission had held a public hearing on the project under Article 75 of the Zoning Regulations and were ready to approve it, but had deferred action until the objections of the Commission of Fine Arts could be heard. Some members of the Zoning Commission had expressed concern about the height of the buildings and the solid wall which would be created by the mass of buildings facing the river front and Virginia Avenue, but it was his impression that they all believed it was in the best interests of the City to allow some development of the site to proceed, if only for tax purposes.

The Commission explained their objections to certain features of the project and discussed in detail the reasons why they disagreed with the computation of the amount of open space shown in the developer's plan. The transcript of that discussion appears as EXHIBIT G.

After hearing the Commission's views General Clarke suggested a conference between the principal architect of the project and the Commission to determine if the objections of the Commission could be resolved. The Commission members replied that they had not been shown any architectural details of the project and that a meeting with the architect would be useful if such information were made available to them. Consequently, it was agreed that Mr. Walker and Mr. Orr would meet with the architect at Mr. Walker's office in New York on April 24th. A representative of the Island Vista Corporation present at the meeting indicated that the architect would attend the meeting. It was understood that the Zoning Commission would defer action on the matter pending the results of the conference in New York.

Thereafter, at 1:00 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C. L. Martin

Counsel

0830. Mr. Walker reviewed Koubek Canal Building and made suggestions
also, bank course; entrance narrow, make simpler; auto entrance
narrow and flat brick arch; arch in posthouse rail,
Satterlee Bldg. Disapp make simpler, shall forward, seeds.

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 April 1962

Shipstead and Georgetown
appendices approved

AM

9:30

1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:35

- a. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service
(Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and
Structural Division, PBS, GSA; Mr. Branch Elam, architect
of Justement, Elam, Callmer and Kidd)

Howard University Classroom Building - Proposed Design

10:00

- b. District of Columbia Government, Department of
Highways and Traffic
(Mr. Harold Aitken, Director of Highways and Traffic)

No Budget at R.C. Bldg

(1) E Street Expressway - Status

(2) Pennsylvania Avenue, Proposed Repaving

10:30

- c. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency
(Mr. Stanley Sherman, Chief, Project Design, RLA; Mr.
Harold Leibman, architect of Lapidus, Harle, Leibman)

Parcel 110c, Southwest Urban Renewal Area - Winning
Design

12:00

- d. National Capital Planning Commission

Adams-Morgan Northwest Urban Renewal Area - Proposed
Renewal Plans

Indy reluctant about
the 1/2 park front in Bldg

25 April 1962

Dear Mr. Boutin:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on April 18, 1962, considered a proposed two-story and penthouse Classroom Building at Howard University, as designed by the architectural firm of Justement, Elam, Callmer and Kidd.

The members of the Commission found the mass and silhouette of the building well designed, but they felt that the architectural treatment of the main facade was less successful. They considered that the treatment of half of the long main facade with vertical emphasis and half with horizontal emphasis would be disturbing and would give the appearance of two different buildings. They recommended that a continuation of the horizontal treatment would lead to a more satisfactory design. The members liked the use of sculptured plaques between the second story windows above the main entrance as part of the architectural treatment.

Mr. Branch Elam of the architectural firm agreed to restudy the design and to present them to the Commission at a later date.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David M. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Bernard Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

25 April 1962

Dear Mr. Snyder:

In the course of the discussion of a proposed Classroom Building for Howard University, at their meeting on 18 April, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts lacked material with which to compare the design to the adjacent Home Economics Building which was reviewed by the Commission in February, 1959. The Commission wrote to the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, on February 20th, recommending several revisions in the design. The final plans for the building were never resubmitted to the Commission for review or for record.

The members of the Commission asked me to determine to what extent the advice of the Commission concerning the Home Economics Building was followed.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder
Director
Architectural and Structural
Division
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

The purpose of this document is to provide information regarding the activities of the Committee to Abolish the Arms Race (CAAR) and its efforts to promote disarmament. The Committee was formed in 1975 and has since been active in various ways, including holding public hearings, publishing reports, and lobbying Congress. The Committee's efforts have been aimed at reducing the arms race and promoting a more peaceful world. The Committee has also been successful in getting Congress to pass several important disarmament bills. The Committee's work is ongoing and it continues to be active in promoting disarmament.

The purpose of this document is to provide information regarding the activities of the Committee to Abolish the Arms Race (CAAR) and its efforts to promote disarmament. The Committee was formed in 1975 and has since been active in various ways, including holding public hearings, publishing reports, and lobbying Congress. The Committee's efforts have been aimed at reducing the arms race and promoting a more peaceful world. The Committee has also been successful in getting Congress to pass several important disarmament bills. The Committee's work is ongoing and it continues to be active in promoting disarmament.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D. C.

27 April 1962

Dear General Clarke:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on April 18, 1962, considered further recent developments in the plans for the proposed E Street Northwest Freeway in the vicinity of the State Department Building, the Headquarters Building, District Chapter, American Red Cross, the new Civil Service Building, now under construction, and Rawlins Park. Mr. H. L. Aitken, Director, Department of Highways and Traffic, presented the plans. Mrs. Chloethiel Smith, architect and consultant, accompanied Mr. Aitken.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were disappointed to learn from Mr. Aitken that their recommendations to place a roof over the roadways to permit the long-planned extension of Rawlins Park would not be carried out. They felt that the abandonment of this plan for a park and the introduction of a depressed roadway would reduce the opportunities for an ordered landscape treatment as a setting for the adjoining highly populated group of governmental office buildings.

The Commission could not agree that construction of a pedestrian bridge across the roadways in front of the Red Cross Building would materially benefit either the setting of that building or the appearance of the area, but recommended retention of a pool and landscaped area on the axis of the main entrance to the building on the south side of the roadway, as shown in the scale model that was presented. They felt that the separation of the roadways helped to relieve the cramped effect noticeable in previous plans, and accepted the idea of a small garden and sculpture between the ingress and egress of the roadways at Twentieth Street, N.W. Careful study should be given to detailing all these features, and the Commission would like to be kept advised of their development.

The members of the Commission were glad to learn that approximately 80 feet more of the depressed roadway than had been previously contemplated would be covered west of Virginia Avenue north of the State Department, thus affording additional opportunity for landscaping. Mrs. Smith's preference for polygonal ashlar as a facing for the exposed retaining walls flanking the roadways was accepted. We would like to see samples of the stone to be used and the pattern of the masonry.

The acceptance of the above noted features should not be construed as approval by the Commission of Fine Arts of the principle of the Inner Loop,

27 April 1962

Dear General Clarke:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on April 17, 1962, considered the design proposed by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic for a brick median strip on Pennsylvania Avenue between First and Fifteenth Streets, Northwest.

Mr. H. L. Aitken, the Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, explained the plans for the buff brick median which would be installed after removal of the street car tracks and during the repaving of the Avenue. The members of the Commission told Mr. Aitken that, in their opinion, the median would detract from the appearance of the Avenue, and they recommended that the abandoned tracks be paved over.

The members also stressed that, in their opinion, it was important not to do anything to the Avenue that might not conform with the plans of the President's Committee on the Redevelopment of the north side of Pennsylvania which is now being established under the direction of Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Brigadier General Frederick J. Clarke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington 4, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

THE END

THE END

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the foregoing pages, in the order in which they are mentioned in the text.

1. The first name mentioned is that of the person who has been named in the text.

2. The second name mentioned is that of the person who has been named in the text.

THE END

THE END

THE END

THE END

but merely the willingness of the Commission to work with you in trying to reduce some of the impact of the Inner Loop on the appearance of important areas of the City.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Brigadier General Frederick J. Clarke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

and hereby the willingness of the Government to send said war to Europe to
be made good of the report of the fact that the Government of Germany
is not at the City.

For the President of the City

Secretary of the City

John W. Foster
Secretary

William Howard Taft
President of the City
John W. Foster
Secretary of the City
John W. Foster
Secretary of the City
John W. Foster
Secretary of the City

27 April 1962

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on April 18, 1962, considered the architectural design for Parcel 110c, Southwest Urban Renewal Area, as developed by Lapidus, Harle and Leibman, architects, who were present to explain their plans.

The members of the Commission liked the general arrangement of the complex of buildings. They suggested, however, that the heat and light reflection from the extensive areas of paving around the apartment buildings might be a source of discomfort to occupants of the buildings, and recommended the use of light-absorbent material for the paving. A greater reliance on landscape plantings was also recommended.

It was also suggested that the use of color on the exterior of the building should be reduced, and noted that the colors shown on the model were more satisfactory than those used in the renderings of the building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David M. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Neville Miller
Chairman
District of Columbia Redevelopment
Land Agency
919 18th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

EXHIBIT E

1941 Dec 25

1941 Dec 25

The Committee of the Board of Directors of the
University of California at Berkeley, California,
has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your
letter of the 14th inst. regarding the matter of
the proposed new building for the Department of
Chemistry.

The Board of Directors of the University of California
at Berkeley, California, has the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. regarding
the matter of the proposed new building for the
Department of Chemistry. The Board of Directors
has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your
letter of the 14th inst. regarding the matter of
the proposed new building for the Department of
Chemistry. The Board of Directors has the honor
to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the
14th inst. regarding the matter of the proposed
new building for the Department of Chemistry.

It is the policy of the Board of Directors of the
University of California at Berkeley, California,
to maintain the highest standards of scholarship
and to provide the best possible facilities for
the advancement of knowledge and the training
of students.

Very truly yours,

James G. Thompson

Chairman of the Board
of Directors

James G. Thompson
Chairman of the Board
of Directors
University of California
at Berkeley
Berkeley, California
94720

27 April 1962

Dear Mrs. Rowe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on April 18, 1962, considered a proposed land-use plan for the Adams-Morgan Urban Renewal Area in Northwest Washington, as prepared by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission, under the direction of Mr. Donald F. Bozarth and Mr. Lawrence S. Press.

In the presentation of the project, the present land-use in the area was compared in detail with the proposed plan. The particular problems of the various parts of the project were outlined and the solutions analyzed. The members were impressed with the thoroughness of the approach to the problems.

The members of the Commission did not have sufficient time to study the proposed solutions in great detail, but their initial reactions were favorable. They were particularly impressed with the effort placed upon solving the economic and social problems in the area by such techniques as concentration of commercial activities and enlargement of recreational and educational facilities. They also were pleased to learn that relatively little demolition of existing structures would be necessary in the area and that efforts would be made to preserve and improve the setting of structures of architectural merit.

The members of the Commission will follow the progress of the Adams-Morgan renewal plan with great interest. They would be glad to see further developments of the renewal plan and to comment on the design of any new buildings in the area when they are prepared.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr.
Chairman
National Capital Planning Commission
Washington 25, D.C.

Page 10

The Committee of the Board of Directors of the University of Chicago, in its report to the Board of Trustees, dated June 1, 1941, states that the Board of Trustees has approved the recommendation of the Committee of the Board of Directors that the University of Chicago should continue to support the work of the National Science Foundation.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, in its report to the Board of Directors, dated June 1, 1941, states that the Board of Directors has approved the recommendation of the Committee of the Board of Directors that the University of Chicago should continue to support the work of the National Science Foundation.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, in its report to the Board of Directors, dated June 1, 1941, states that the Board of Directors has approved the recommendation of the Committee of the Board of Directors that the University of Chicago should continue to support the work of the National Science Foundation.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, in its report to the Board of Directors, dated June 1, 1941, states that the Board of Directors has approved the recommendation of the Committee of the Board of Directors that the University of Chicago should continue to support the work of the National Science Foundation.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, in its report to the Board of Directors, dated June 1, 1941, states that the Board of Directors has approved the recommendation of the Committee of the Board of Directors that the University of Chicago should continue to support the work of the National Science Foundation.

Very truly yours,

John D. Wilson
Chairman

John D. Wilson
Chairman
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C.

MR. ORR: With those reservations, I will second.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion. There is a second.

All in favor say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was then put to a vote and unanimously carried.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much.

(Exeunt)

CONSIDERATION OF ISLAND VISTA DEVELOPMENT

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right, General Clark, would you like to start?

GENERAL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, as I say I am not here to sell anything. I think I am coming largely at your request so that we can discuss the problem that seems to face all of us on the Island Vista Development.

The status of it at the moment is that under our zoning regulation, Article 75, the Planning Commission has given approval to the project in general. The Zoning Commission has held a public hearing and has deferred action, particularly until we can hear further from the Fine Arts Commission.

The street closings have been heard and if all of the project is approved, the street closings will be approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With those amendments I will second.

CHAIRMAN: (SPEAKING) Now we have heard the

motion. There is a second.

All in favor say "aye"; opposed, "no."

(The motion was then put to a vote and unanimously

carried.)

CHAIRMAN: (SPEAKING) Now we have heard the

(SPEAKING)

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND FORESTS

CHAIRMAN: (SPEAKING) Now we have heard the

motion. There is a second.

CHAIRMAN: (SPEAKING) Now we have heard the

I am not here to tell you that I think I am doing anything
of your request so that we can discuss the motion and make

to take all of us on the island for development.

The status of the island is that under our

coming regulation, Article 17, the island is under our

given approval to the project in general. The island is

island has held a public hearing and has received notice

particularly until we can hear from the island

Committee.

The project is under review and all of the

project is approved, the project is approved.

I think this is a fair statement.

But no approval actions have been signed on any of these pending the completion of the entire package because it seems to go in that form.

At our zoning commission hearing yesterday, when we considered this problem, and after my telephone conference, conversation with you, as I said, we acted to defer on this. We took no vote. We tried to see what the sentiments were of the members of the Zoning Commission.

I think many of the thoughts that you have expressed were expressed by members of the Zoning Commission. They were concerned about the height, particularly a solid line of height. This, again, as I say, we did not take a vote on. These were expressions of opinion.

I think the appearance of a solid wall also concerned some of the members of the Zoning Commission.

On the other hand, I think it was a unanimous feeling there that some arrangement on the property other than something like this would certainly be in the best interests of the city and it is in the interest of the city to allow some development to go ahead there as rapidly as possible, simply for tax considerations.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: This isn't an arrangement. It is merely a study of what is allowable.

I think this is a fair statement.

But no approval action have been signed on any of these pending the completion of the entire package because it seems to be in that form.

At our meeting commission meeting yesterday, when we considered this problem, and after my telephone conference, conversation with you, as I said, we asked to return on this. We took no vote. We tried to see what the sentiments were of the members of the Joint Commission.

I think many of the thoughts that you have expressed were expressed by members of the Joint Commission. They were concerned about the height, particularly a solid line of height. This, again, as I say, we did not take a vote on. There were expressions of opinion.

I think the appearance of a solid wall also concerned some of the members of the Joint Commission.

On the other hand, I think it was a unanimous feeling there that some arrangement on the property other than some thing like this would certainly be in the best interest of the city and it is in the interest of the city to allow some arrangement to be made there as rapidly as possible, simply for consideration.

CHAIRMAN KILPATRICK: This isn't an arrangement. It is

merely a study of what is allowable.

GENERAL CLARK: I just pointed it out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is not an architectural arrangement.

GENERAL CLARK: I point to that as a rectilinear.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: A possibility under present zoning regulations.

GENERAL CLARK: As you will recall, the architects for the developers have laid out another scheme. I am not sure who the architect was who laid it out but I don't think any of us would hire him. But it does show a possibility of --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I remember they had another scheme.

GENERAL CLARK: Of a rather congested apartment development which is permitted today under our existing zoning regulations.

So, I think we face the problem that we want to get the open areas that these people have conceived in their general layout.

I believe it would be fair to say that the Zoning Commission is willing to give the 130-foot height but expressed concern over a continuous line at 130 feet, particularly since 130 feet at the upper corner means that down here you are talking about 157 or 158 feet above ground level, although this is stepped down in the architect's plan. There is a difference in ground elevation from here to here of about 28 feet, and

GENERAL CLARK: I just pointed it out.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: It is not an architectural drawing.

right.

GENERAL CLARK: I point to that as a reflection.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: A possibility under present zoning

regulations.

GENERAL CLARK: As you will recall, the architect

for the newspapers have laid out another scheme. I am not

sure the architect was who laid it out but I don't know

any of us would like him. But it does show a possibility of --

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: I remember they had another scheme.

GENERAL CLARK: It is rather complicated apartment

development which is something more than our existing

apartment regulations.

So, I think we have established that we want to get

the open areas that local people have conceived in their general

interest.

I believe it would be fair to say that the Planning

Commission is willing to give the 150-foot height but experienced

concern over a continuous line at 150 feet, particularly since

150 feet at the lower corner means that you have got to

bring about 15' or 16' feet above ground level, although this

is stepped down in the southeast part. There is a difference

in ground elevation from here to here of about 25 feet, and

under our regulations this would be controlling the ground elevation or, although it is 90 feet down here with relation to this point -- so, I think our problem is one that really is an architectural problem of getting about the same density of occupancy which in this case the developer has shown to be less than is authorized under this type of arrangement, getting that density of occupancy in an arrangement which is satisfactory to you and to the committee.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think there are two things here we are interested in: the height of the buildings would rise and also the open space remaining.

MR. ORR: Also the density. We can't agree with the developers on the amount of density there. Under a scheme of this kind, which is what can be done in the present zoning, at least, we figure that this is about 461 people per acre whereas this development is 580.

Beyond that, I don't think anyone quarrels at all with the assembly hall. We are all in favor of that. I think we disagree basically with the height of the buildings which, of course, adds to the density, the amount of free land that is left, one compared to the other.

Our computation shows 225,000 square feet in this instance. In this one it is 236,000.

GENERAL CLARK: This is with the streets?

under our regulations this would be considered the ground
elevation of, although it is 92 feet above the water
at this point -- so, I think our decision is that really is
an architectural problem of getting above the water level
of occupancy which in fact does the elevation has been to be
less than is required under this type of arrangement, getting
that density of occupancy in an arrangement which is satis-
factory to you and to the committee.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think there are two things here
we are interested in: the height of the buildings would rise
and also the open space remaining.

MR. GAY: I agree generally. We can't agree with the
development on the amount of density there. Under a scheme of
this kind, what we want can be done in the present zoning,
at least, we figure that this is about 400 people per acre
whereas this development is 200.

Beyond that, I don't think anyone questions at all
with the assembly hall. We are all in favor of that. I think
we disagree basically with the height of the buildings which
of course, also in the density, the amount of free land that
is left, one compared to the other.

Our organization shows 250,000 square feet in this
instance. In this case it is 450,000.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is still the question?

MR. ORR: This gets up to 581 -- a lot of difference. Virtually the same area.

GENERAL CLARK: You have the figures here. I am sure you have the brochures on this project. My understanding is that the square footage of living space in here as compared to what would be permissible under current zoning is about the same.

MR. ORR: Without the added height of the buildings.

GENERAL CLARK: Much-reduced coverage.

MR. WALKER: General Clark, you have to figure this density as a day-time density population as well as a living population density.

In other words, you are taking a certain population and keeping the density for living purposes there. You are taking several purposes, such as hotel, an office building, and so on and so forth.

The way we are measuring is that the density of the total occupancy during the day time is the density that should be used.

GENERAL CLARK: Perhaps the fairest measure would be the square footage of the building.

MR. WALKER: That is what we have tried to arrive at.

GENERAL CLARK: As compared to the other?

MR. CHAIR: This will be the last of the afternoon.

Virtually the same time.

GENERAL CHAIR: You have the figures here, I am

sure you have the program in this project. By understanding

is that the square footage of living space in here as compared

to what would be possible under current zoning is about

the same.

MR. CHAIR: Without the added weight of the building.

GENERAL CHAIR: What reduced coverage.

MR. WALKER: General Chair, you have no figure

this density as a top-line density calculation as well as a

living population density.

In other words, you are taking a certain population

and keeping the density the living purposes there. You are

taking several purposes, such as hotel, an office building,

and so on and so forth.

The way we are measuring is that the density of the

total occupancy during the day time is the density that would

be used.

GENERAL CHAIR: Before we finish measure would

be the square footage of the building.

MR. WALKER: That is what we have tried to arrive

at.

GENERAL CHAIR: We compared to the density

MR. WALKER: Because what you do have are all the services that come to those buildings which increase the number of vehicles that have to move into the neighborhood and all that sort of stuff, which again is something that applies towards density problems.

GENERAL CLARK: Do I sense what the Fine Arts Commission says, that in essence you don't want anything over 90 feet?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Isn't this a special dispensation given this project for 130 feet?

GENERAL CLARK: You are going to face the same problem in Columbia Plaza, not in the identical location, but you are going to face the same problem again there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is one difference, that this is much nearer to the Cultural Center and the monuments in the area than Columbia Plaza.

GENERAL CLARK: No question about it. This is right adjacent to the Cultural Center site.

I had better not get into an architectural discussion. I know that certain things please my eye and certain things don't.

It was my understanding that this development and the developer and the architect in the working up of it have coordinated quite carefully with the Planning Commission.

MR. WALKER: Because what you do have are all the

revenues that come to those buildings which increase the
number of vehicles that have to travel through the neighborhood
and all that sort of thing, which means as a result that
applied towards facility problems.

GENERAL CLARK: Do I assume about the River Area

Commission says, that in essence you don't want anything over
50 feet?

CHAIRMAN KIMLEY: Isn't this a special dispensation

given this project for 125 feet?

GENERAL CLARK: Yes and going to take the same

problem in Columbia River, not in the historical location, but
you are going to face the same problem again there.

CHAIRMAN KIMLEY: There is one difference, that this

is much nearer to the Central Center and the monuments in the
area than Columbia River.

GENERAL CLARK: No question about it. This is right

adjacent to the Central Center site.

I had better not get into an architectural dis-

cussion. I know that certain things please my eye and certain
things don't.

It was my understanding that this development and
the developer and the architect in the working up of it have
coordinated quite carefully with the Planning Commission.

I understood, of course, they had been to your group at least once with this. I don't know what you expressed at that particular time with regard to the curvilinear aspects of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We didn't express any opinion except listen to them.

GENERAL CLARK: I think they came away a little encouraged. Perhaps they misinterpreted the sense of the meeting at the time. But certainly they developed this in full coordination with the staff of the Planning Commission -- no question about that -- and received favorable reception there.

I know that the Fine Arts Commission has continually expressed reservation with respect to the 130-foot height.

I feel the added expression now that you are saying that no more square footage of building space should be permitted here than is permitted here.

Do you have their booklet? This could be resolved in a matter of seconds by looking at what is allowable under the law as compared with the other.

Perhaps I am misinformed. My understanding here was the square footage here turned out to be less than permitted here.

I understand, of course, they have been in your mind

at least once with this. I don't know what you expected at
that particular time with respect to the situation aspects of

12.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We don't know any opinion

except listen to them.

GENERAL BAKER: I think they come from a little

misunderstanding. Perhaps they misinterpreted the nature of the
meeting at the time. But certainly they developed this in
full consultation with the staff of the Planning Commission --
no question about that -- and certainly favorable reception

there.

I know that the Joint State Commission has continually

expressed reservation with respect to the 150-foot height.

I feel the added reservation now that you are saying

that no more specific language in building codes should be per-

mitted here than is permitted here.

No you have your doubts? That would be resolved

in a matter of seconds by looking at what is allowable under the

law as compared with the other.

Perhaps I am misinformed. If understanding here

was one specific language here turned out to be less than per-

mitted here.

MR. ORR: That is not our interpretation. Also, our interpretation referred to the --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The roofs of those villas are considered open space in this arrangement.

GENERAL CLARK: Green.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Not space the public can walk on.

GENERAL CLARK: This little booklet clarifies these points.

I didn't come to plead for this. I am looking for advice from you.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You came at our invitation. These are the points we wanted to raise.

This special dispensation given in this case to erect a building 130-feet high, in a very sensitive area -- that is something that does concern us.

MR. ORR: Very much.

I think also, gentlemen, in relation to the Cultural Center adjacent to this, if, as, and when it is built, it may not be as large a project as we wish to indicate, the height of these buildings will dominate the Cultural Center itself. You have the highway itself on one side and the Cultural Center will be sort of down in a hole.

The other thing I think we have to worry about is the curvilinear form of the buildings.

Mr. Goss: That is not our interpretation. Also,

our interpretation referred to the --

CHAIRMAN VINCENT: The room of those called the

contingent open space in this arrangement.

CHAIRMAN VINCENT: Good.

CHAIRMAN VINCENT: Not space the public can walk on.

CHAIRMAN VINCENT: This little booklet describes these

points.

I didn't come to pick for this. I am looking for

advice from you.

CHAIRMAN VINCENT: You come at our invitation.

There are the points we wanted to raise.

This special discussion given in this case to

erect a building 130-foot high, in a very sensitive area --

there is something that does concern us.

Mr. Goss: Very much.

I think that, gentlemen, in relation to the Cultural

Center adjacent to this, it is, and when it is built, it

may not be as large a project as we wish to indicate, the

height of these buildings will dominate the Cultural Center

itself. You have the highest itself on one side and the

Cultural Center will be sort of down in a hole.

The other thing I think we have to worry about is

the curvilinear form of the buildings.

GENERAL CLARK: You were exposed to this once before; I thought the people left here with the feeling that you were sort of patting them on the back.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We must correct that because it was a very preliminary --

GENERAL CLARK: You are expressing disapproval of the curvilinear aspect?

MR. WALKER: What we asked for at that time was to have the plans of these buildings brought to our attention, not just this type of thing, but how you develop these funny curves into room spaces on the inside, what they looked like, and so on. In other words, so we had some complete idea as to the whole project. We have never had a complete idea of it. We have had this type of thing and some pictures of perspectives of models and that sort of thing; so that there has been no general feeling as to just how this plan really worked. That is what we asked for at that time, as I remember it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We considered this very much the same as that, the amount of space covered, not the design of the buildings. I have never understood that there were buildings designed.

GENERAL CLARK: Building concepts.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Concepts of coverage of space.

GENERAL CLARK: You were exposed to this kind of

force? I thought the people left here with the feeling that

you were sort of getting out of the way.

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: We must admit that because of

was a very real thing.

GENERAL CLARK: You are suggesting that they are

the unwilling victims.

MR. WILKINS: Now we asked for at that time was to

have the sense of some intelligent thought in our attention,

not just this type of thing, but now you develop these things

curves into your space on the inside, what took place there,

and so on. In other words, we had some complete idea of

in the whole program. We had never had a complete idea of

it. We have had this type of thing and some pictures of

representatives of people and they sort of thing, so that there

has been no general feeling as to just how this thing really

worked. That is what we asked for at that time, as I re-

member.

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: We considered this very much the

time as that, the amount of space occupied, the design of

the building. I have never understood that there were

building conditions.

GENERAL CLARK: Building conditions.

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: Concepts of systems of space.

MR. WALKER: Then I think that we also once recommended that this space be bought as a park.

MR. WILSON: We did.

GENERAL CLARK: That is a very fine recommendation but who has the money to buy it, is the question.

MR. WALKER: I don't know. But that gives you some idea of our feeling about the use of this space.

GENERAL CLARK: The fact of the matter is that the land is in private ownership and the man is entitled to build there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Has any request been made to the Congress to appropriate the money for a park?

GENERAL CLARK: I am sure that there have been some informal requests along this line because -- but I don't know of any successful.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: No bill has been introduced to do that?

GENERAL CLARK: Not to my knowledge, no, sir.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Our feeling is, it is an extremely important area in the Shipstead area, by the river, near the Cultural Center, near the Lincoln Memorial, and so on, and therefore the bulk of this is --

GENERAL CLARK: I think this is the basic problem that faces you: you don't want anything there.

MR. WALKER: Then I think that we have done enough.

General Clark: I don't know. He has been a long time.

MR. WALKER: We did.

GENERAL CLARK: That is a very good question.

but you are the owner of the land, and the government.

MR. WALKER: I don't know. But what if we do?

some part of our territory about the use of this space.

GENERAL CLARK: The fact of the matter is that the

land is in private ownership and the man is entitled to sell it.

There.

CHAIRMAN WALKER: How can you expect him to do

business to appropriate the money for a day?

GENERAL CLARK: I am sure that there have been some

informal requests along this line because -- but I don't know

of any successful.

CHAIRMAN WALKER: He still has been introduced to do

that?

GENERAL CLARK: Not to my knowledge, no, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALKER: On Tuesday, it is an extremely

important area in the Shoshone area, by the river, near the

Colville Center, near the Lincoln Memorial, and so on, and

therefore the bulk of this is --

GENERAL CLARK: I think this is the basic problem

that faces you, you don't want anything done.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We prefer a park, of course, but if we cant get a park, we would like to have something that does not compete too much with the memorials and other things as to height, and so on.

GENERAL CLARK: I will tell you my feeling in the Planning Commission when I voted on this, and the Zoning Commission where I have not voted, was that they were giving us something a lot better than what would be possible under this.

It seemed to me to be about an even swap that was involved. In return for the added height that would be allowed, we are getting a much more pleasing area than would be developed under a routine development under our current zoning.

MR. WALKER: On that I think we would go along with you, no question about that.

GENERAL CLARK: This is something we have to keep in mind. As long as it is in private ownership, we have to allow that man to develop it.

MR. WALKER: But you are also giving them some land from the public streets so that actually, in the swap that you get back for these public streets, you ought to get back something that might pass the Fine Arts Commission.

GENERAL CLARK: I am not certain that is going to be

CHAIRMAN TIMLEY: To present a bill, of course, but

if we can't get a bill, we would like to have something that
does not conflict too much with the materials and other things
as to help, and so on.

GENERAL CLARK: I will tell you my feeling in the

Planning Commission when I voted on this, and the Planning
Commission when I have not voted, was that they were giving
us something a lot better than what would be possible under
this.

It seemed to me to be about an even swap that was

involved. In return for the added benefit that would be
allowed, we are getting a much more pleasing area than would
be developed under a routine development under our current
zoning.

MR. WALKER: Or what I think we would be doing

with you, no question about that.

GENERAL CLARK: This is something we have to keep

in mind. As long as it is in private ownership, we have to
allow that man to develop it.

MR. WALKER: For you are also giving them some

land from the public streets as that actually, in the swap
that you get back for these public streets, you ought to get
back something that might give the Fine Arts Commission.

GENERAL CLARK: I am not certain that is going to be

possible in this case.

MR. WALKER: The point about it is, that there is a definite public responsibility on this as far as the use of public lands is concerned.

GENERAL CLARK: I think the nature of the discussion here is one having to do with the appearance of it, and I would defer to your judgment.

I think perhaps the easiest way to resolve this is a conference with the architects and yourselves so that you can talk in these architectural terms.

I feel that the city owes the man the right to build there at least to a density that would be permitted in this.

MR. WALKER: I agree.

GENERAL CLARK: I like the idea of an Article 75 development rather than a rectilinear pattern; and we have got to work out something that will allow him to do that. It is his land. In spite of all our hopes that it might be acquired for a park, it belongs to him and --

MR. WALKER: He doesn't own the streets yet.

GENERAL CLARK: No, but in return for opening up the area and not occupying it at the same ground coverage that would be permitted in this area, I feel that the public gains from that.

I think our Zoning Commission is inclined that way.

possible in this case.

MR. WALKER: Two points about it is, that there is a

serious public responsibility on this as far as the use of

public lands is concerned.

GENERAL CHAIR: I think the nature of the discussion

here is the having to do with the appearance of it, and I

would defer to your judgment.

I think perhaps the easiest way to resolve this is

a conference with the scientists and geologists so that you

can talk in these administrative terms.

I feel that the only ones who have the right to make

them at least to a certain extent and be permitted in this.

MR. WALKER: I agree.

GENERAL CHAIR: I like the idea of an Article 7

development rather than a wilderness setting, and we have

not so far and something that will allow him to do that. It

is his land. In spite of all our hopes that it might be

acquired for a park, it belongs to him and --

MR. WALKER: He doesn't own the strata yet.

GENERAL CHAIR: No, but in terms of opening up the

area and not considering it as the same ground coverage that

would be permitted in this area, I feel that the public's right

is that.

I think our zoning commission is inclined that way.

Our problem now is to get something in there that will allow the man to achieve the density that he could get in this, in a pleasing arrangement which, hopefully, will have the sanction of the Fine Arts Commission.

MR. WALKER: I don't want to get into an argument, but if you look at the building site over here on the left you will look at the streets that are there and begin to realize the fact that that is a relationship of open space. You take that open space that you speak of there and put it over here and you are greatly surprised to find that there is only about five percent more supposed open space on that one than there is on this one.

MR. ORR: And that is being paid for by added height.

MR. WALKER: That's right. He is getting back more than he is giving.

GENERAL CLARK: 236,000 square feet of open space of which 140,000 was arrived at by closing the streets.

MR. WALKER: And according to our estimates, there are twice as many people on this as there are under the one on the land.

GENERAL CLARK: I was hoping to find here where the square footage of building space is set forth under one pattern as compared with the other. I believe I can.

Our problem now is to get something in there that

will allow the man to understand the building that he would like

in this, in a planning arrangement which, hopefully, will have

the sanction of the Planning Commission.

MR. WALKER: I would want to get into an agreement,

but if you look at the building side over here on the left

you will look at the square feet and there and begin to

normalize the fact that there is a relationship of open space.

You take that open space that you speak of there and put it

over here and you are greatly surprised to find that there

is only about five percent more open space on that

one than there is on this one.

MR. GALT: The fact is being paid for by added

height.

MR. WALKER: That's right. He is paying for

more than he is giving.

GENERAL CLARK: 250,000 square feet of open space

of which 150,000 was reserved at the clearing the forest.

MR. WALKER: That according to our estimates, there

are twice as many people on this as there are on the one

on the land.

GENERAL CLARK: I was hoping to find more people

the square footage of building space is not forth mean one

pattern as compared with the other. I believe I can,

2,192,000 feet of building space, above ground, and parking garages and service areas below ground. Certainly there is more parking provided than current zoning would require -- far in excess of that requirement. Certainly this is an asset which we shouldn't cast aside.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, General Clark has made a suggestion that perhaps we meet, ought to meet, with the architects again. What I am wondering --

GENERAL CLARK: You will have to, anyway, because this is under your Shipstead-Luce Act and you have to pass on this.

MR. WALKER: That's right.

I am just wondering whether you would defer any action on the part of the zoning until we have a chance to take some action here?

GENERAL CLARK: When would this be, perhaps?

MR. WALKER: Next month.

I am perfectly willing to come down on a special day.

GENERAL CLARK: I think perhaps this would be -- I feel again --

MR. WALKER: How about you, Douglas?

GENERAL CLARK: As you gentlemen recognize --

MR. ORR: Rough going.

2,192,000 feet of building space, above ground, and

parking garages and service areas below ground. Certainly

there is more parking provided than current zoning would re-

quire -- far in excess of that requirement. Certainly this is

an asset which we shouldn't cast aside.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, General Clark has made a

suggestion that perhaps we need, apart from that, with the

architects again. What I am wondering --

GENERAL CLARK: You will have to, anyway, because

this is under your jurisdiction and you have to pass on

this.

MR. WALKER: That's right.

I am just wondering whether you would offer any

action on the part of the zoning until we have a chance to

take some action here?

GENERAL CLARK: When would this be, perhaps?

MR. WALKER: Next month.

I am perfectly willing to come down on a special

day.

GENERAL CLARK: I believe perhaps this would be --

I too! Again --

MR. WALKER: How about you, Douglas?

GENERAL CLARK: We are available tomorrow --

MR. ORR: Thank you.

GENERAL CLARK: You gentlemen recognize that the Zoning Commission deferred action initially on this so that many of the thoughts that you have expressed here today might be more thoroughly explored, such as the possibility that the government might take it. Now that possibility appears to have vanished. This was at the request of the Planning Commission that you defer action. If we keep going on, we will defer this man to the point this is the only thing we will get.

That is the wrong way to treat the man.

If you could meet with the architects and discuss the pros and cons of footage with him, you certainly are more qualified than I am to do it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we ought to see some preliminary designs, drawings of the design before it goes too far because we haven't seen those yet.

GENERAL CLARK: We have the chicken and the egg situation. He doesn't want to go too far down the rosy path on design until he is fairly certain he gets some accord on what might be built there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will be glad to meet with him. Our meeting is the 16th of May.

GENERAL CLARK: There isn't a possibility that perhaps your architectural members could meet earlier?

GENERAL CHAIRMAN: Now another question that the

Working Committee deferred action in this on this
many of the thoughts that you have expressed here today might
be more thoroughly explored, such as the possibility that
the Government might take it. Now that possibility appears
to have vanished. This was at the moment of the Working
Committee that was later called. It was long ago, but we
will defer that matter to the point that is the only thing we
will get.

There is one more way to meet the need.

If you could meet with the architects and designers
the price and cost of housing with this, you certainly are more
qualified than I am to do it.

CHAIRMAN WINTER: I think we ought to see some

preliminary designs, drawings of the design before it goes
too far because we haven't seen them yet.

GENERAL CHAIRMAN: We have the design and the one

situation. It doesn't seem to go too far from the home
on design until we are fairly certain we have some working on
what might be called it.

CHAIRMAN WINTER: We will be glad to meet with this.

Our meeting is the last of the year.

GENERAL CHAIRMAN: There isn't a possibility that

perhaps your organization would want to meet with this?